

Can you proof this rough draft. Thanks.

Bremerton Police Department

Memo

To: Captain Burchett

From: Lieutenant Davis

Date: 2-1-17

On Re:

CC:

On 12-19-16 I received a Supervisors Report of Citizen's Complaint form from Captain Wolfe. The complaint originated from Penn Plaza's owner Trip McConkey. McConkey is the victim of a Theft of a large oil tank from his business on 12-14-16 and the complaint stemmed from his contact with Sgt Meade.

On 12-14-16 McConkey came to the BPD and contacted Officer VanSantford at the front desk. Officer VanSantford took the initial information for the report to include assigning a case number, #B16-009808. At the conclusion of Officer VanSantford's contact with McConkey, he advised him an officer would contact him shortly. Officer VanSantford advised Sgt. Crane and Officer Corey of this event.

Sgt. Crane assigned the case to Officer Corey to follow-up on. Officer Corey then became involved with a "convoluted Fraud case" according to Sgt. Crane, who provided me a memo on his recollection of what occurred. McConkey was not contacted on the 14th or 15th by anyone from BPD. McConkey called back on the 16th and spoke with Sgt. Meade. Sgt. Crane also advised he informed Sgt. Meade "late Friday that McConkey wanted contact."

Sgt. Meade contacted McConkey by phone and according to McConkey, Sgt. Meade was rude and made him feel like calling 911 about his Theft was a waste of the Bremerton Police Departments time. After McConkey spoke with Sgt. Meade on 12-16-16, he felt like his case was not getting the attention it deserved, especially because he had video and photos of the suspect vehicle. McConkey came to the BPD on Saturday 12-17-16 to drop off the thumb drive of the surveillance video but he was surprised to find the office not open. McConkey was contacted by Ofc. Corey, who he described as very helpful.

On 12-19-16 McConkey completed a written complaint to Chief Strachan.

I reviewed the written complaint from Trip McConkey and the memo provided at my request from Sgt. Crane. I contacted Sgt. Meade and requested a written memo in regards to his contact with McConkey. Sgt. Meade completed the memo on 12-20-16.

On 1-31-17 I contacted Trip McConkey by phone and advised I wished to interview him regarding his complaint. McConkey and I met on 2-1-17 at his place of business. I asked McConkey to explain what occurred. McConkey talked about his initial contact with Officer VanSantford and described him as very courteous. McConkey was surprised it took BPD two days to call him back reference picking up the thumb drive and surveillance photos he printed. McConkey stated at approximately 1645 hrs. on 12-16-16, he received a phone call from Sgt. Meade. McConkey stated Sgt. Meade told him he would have to check with the shift supervisor as he was preparing to go off shift and go home. McConkey advised he explained to Sgt. Meade that he believed the suspect vehicle used in this Theft was parked on "F" St. Sgt. Meade explained to McConkey he drove by the "F" St residence and did not observe the pickup described to him. McConkey also stated Sgt. Meade asked in an arrogant manner as to why he allowed these suspects on his property to begin with. McConkey explained he leaves his gates open for customers to enter/exit as it is a storage facility. Sgt. Meade completed a supplemental report stating he drove by the listed address, which did not exist and did not observe a pickup matching what McConkey explained to him.

Sgt. Meade concluded his supplemental report by requesting this case go back to Officer VanSantford for follow-up. McConkey asked Sgt. Meade during the phone call if he (McConkey) drove by the suspect residence and

observed the suspect vehicle there, could he call 911 and ask the police to contact the suspect. McConkey stated Sgt. Meade told him "pretty much all I can do is ask their side of the story." McConkey explained to me he felt there was more Sgt. Meade could do based on surveillance photos of his stolen tank in the back of a pickup truck. McConkey told Sgt. Meade he had a thumb drive he wanted to provide BPD, which showed the suspect vehicle with the stolen tank in the back leaving his business. McConkey stated Sgt. Meade told him to drop it off on Saturday morning and BPD would look into it.

McConkey stopped by the BPD on Saturday 12-17-16 and found the doors were locked and the office was closed. McConkey stated he thought this was odd since Sgt. Meade asked him to drop it off Saturday morning.

McConkey stated he called 911 and was contacted by Officer Corey approximately 25 minutes later. McConkey said he "had the opposite conversation" with Officer Corey than he did with Sgt. Meade regarding BPD's ability to follow this up as he was producing surveillance video with possible suspect information. McConkey stated Officer Corey tried to get the thumb drive from me but I told him I would bring it down to BPD on Monday.

McConkey stated he was contacted again by phone by Sgt. Meade. McConkey stated he wanted to drop off the thumb drive and Sgt. Meade asked him "what do you want me to do." McConkey advised Sgt. Meade he wanted him to have the thumb drive so he could look at video and follow-up on this. McConkey stated Sgt. Meade again asked what he wanted him to do. McConkey felt like Sgt. Meade had a "better things to do attitude." McConkey described Sgt. Meade as "very terse." McConkey then told Sgt. Meade he had dropped the thumb drive off to which Sgt. Meade replied, "great, what else do you want me to do."

McConkey further explained he understands BPD is short-handed and this was not the biggest crime in the world, but Sgt. Meade's attitude towards this case was not the same service he has received when working with BPD in the past. McConkey has worked with BPD on several cases in the past assisting BPD with video surveillance of crimes occurring at McConkey's business and the surrounding area. McConkey concluded by stating his interaction with Officer Corey is the service he normally gets when having contact with a Bremerton Police Officer.

I reviewed Sgt. Meade's memo to me regarding his contact with McConkey. Sgt. Meade advised he was working overtime on this day (12-16-16) when he was informed to contact McConkey. Sgt. Meade advised he reviewed the initial report prepared by Officer VanSantford. Sgt. Meade advised he checked the area of "F" St and learned the address provided by McConkey did not exist and he did not observe the suspect vehicle in the area.

Sgt. Meade contacted McConkey by phone and advised him of his findings. Sgt. Meade confirmed McConkey wanted to turn over the thumb drive and he told McConkey he was going off shift and could have another officer pick it up. Sgt. Meade also confirmed he told McConkey he could turn the thumb drive in to an officer the next day (Saturday).

Sgt. Meade advised McConkey to? reached out to social media regarding the Theft and that McConkey was contacted by a neighbor of the suspect, who advised they would call if the suspect vehicle returned. Sgt. Meade also advised that McConkey told him the suspects who took the tank were tenants of the storage facility and they had permission to be on the property but not to take the tank.

I asked McConkey about this statement and he said at no time did he tell Sgt. Meade the suspects were known to him and that he would not cooperate with identifying them. Officer VanSantford documented in his report that McConkey told him the suspects were known to him. Sgt. Meade did advise in his statement that he forwarded this report back to Officer VanSantford, an officer on light duty working the front desk, to follow-up with McConkey to try and identify the suspects.

During my conversation with McConkey, he advised after posting the suspect vehicle information on social media, he has since been "friended" by the owner of the suspect vehicle, (b) (6). McConkey advised a second post on Facebook revealed the second suspect is possibly named (b) (6).

On 1-19-17 Sgt. Meade contacted McConkey by phone and advised McConkey was upset over the fact that he (Sgt. Meade) told him to drop the thumb drive off at the BPD on a Saturday knowing BPD was closed. Sgt. Meade assumed McConkey would see that the BPD was closed and would call 911 to have an officer meet him there.

Sgt. Meade advised McConkey gave him the "impression he had dropped the thumb drive off on Saturday with an officer and it was at the front desk."

Sgt. Meade then informed McConkey the address given for the suspect vehicle was not valid and that he would perform area checks for the suspect vehicle. Sgt. Meade also told McConkey the best plan for locating the suspect vehicle was through the neighbor who contacted him via Facebook. Sgt. Meade advised there was a long pause and that McConkey hung the phone up on him.

Sgt. Meade advised he drove to the central office and spoke with Officer VanSantford who advised McConkey had not dropped off the thumb drive as he had implied. Officer VanSantford advised McConkey had dropped the thumb drive off on Monday. Sgt. Meade advised Officer VanSantford viewed the surveillance video which did not show any person in enough detail for identification. Sgt. Meade advised he spoke with Officer VanSantford about contacting McConkey about the tenant list for Penn Plaza but was informed McConkey was now insisting he didn't know the suspects.

Sgt. Meade concluded his investigation by stating this case was coming to an end absent 1) sending someone to the suspects listed address out of county, 2) pending a call from McConkey's neighbors who were watching for the suspect vehicle or 3) McConkey providing the names of the tenants he believed responsible. Sgt. Meade again advised me about McConkey recanting his knowledge of the person who took the tank and accessed his property.

After my interview with McConkey, I felt there were two potential policy violations to investigate.

340.3.10 CONDUCT TOWARD THE PUBLIC

Treat the public in a civil and professional manner that conveys an attitude of service and which fosters public respect and cooperation. Don't be overbearing or use language that belittles or intimidates. Give your rank or position, last name and badge number to any person who requests it.

340.3.20 NEGLECT OF DUTY

Diligently direct your attention to performing your duty throughout the work day. Take official action when required. Don't conceal yourself to avoid the public or work. Respond without delay to all calls for police assistance from citizens or other officers.

Disposition:

After speaking with McConkey and reviewing the case reports completed by Officer VanSantford and Sgt. Meade, I believe there are two differing accounts, depending on who I speak with of the interaction between Sgt. Meade and McConkey. I do not believe there is sufficient evidence to prove Sgt. Meade violated the policy of Conduct Toward the Public.

However, based on my review of this matter, I do believe the service McConkey received by being passed around from Officer VanSantford, to Sgt. Meade then to Officer Corey then back to Sgt. Meade is not in keeping with "owning your details" and with the level of service BPD expects from its officers. I have spoken with Sgt. Meade about the disposition in this matter and about the expectations in that if a Sergeant is working overtime covering an area, that Sergeant is expected to "own that detail" similar to what we expect of our patrol officers. McConkey was passed around from officer to officer and when this occurs, it highlights a level of service not expected of our officers. A "Letter of Discussion" was issued to Sgt. Meade in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Lieutenant Mike Davis #408

Lieutenant Mike Davis #408
Bremerton Police Department
360-473-5233 desk
360-204-2731 cell